

REMARKS

Claims 23-38 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant editorially amends claims 23 and 31. The amendment to claims 23 and 31 were made for reasons of precision of language and consistency, and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims and thus do not implicate an estoppel in the application of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 23 and 31 do not raise new issues that would require further search and/or consideration.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 23-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 23-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments being made herein.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,934 to Chen (hereinafter “Chen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,924,802 to Sakurai (hereinafter “Sakurai”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following comments.

Independent claim 23, among a number of unique features, recites: “a clearer configured to clear the data buffer if the detector detects that the printer cable is unplugged after a

transmission of the printing data has started, and not to clear the data buffer if the detector detects that the printer cable is unplugged when the transmission of the printing data has not started.”

In the exemplary embodiment of the present invention, data is cleared when the cable is unplugged provided however, the transmission of the printing data has started. That is, even when the cable is unplugged but the transmission of the printing data has not started, the data already present in the data buffer will remain there. The clearer clears a data buffer which is downstream from the detector that detects that a printer cable is unplugged. In other words, an error which occurs at an upstream side of the data buffer results in clearing of the data buffer (at the downstream side of the error). In short, the printer predicts that an error will occur in a unit at the downstream side when an error occurs in a unit at the upstream side, and as a result, the printer clears this downstream unit. It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned above.

Chen, on the other hand, discloses a print system having a plurality of error detection units 6A, 6B, 6C and 6D. In Chen, the error detection unit 6A is placed at a build sheet unit 15, the error detection unit 6B is placed at a sheet tracking unit 25, and the error detection units 6C and 6D are placed in a printer engine 4. If any one of the error detection units 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D detects an error, a clear printstream unit 37 clears both the sheet tracking unit 25 and the build sheet unit 15 (Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 5-27). That is, the print system of Chen clears the units

25 and 15 that are at an upstream side of the error detection units 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D. In other words, the clear printstream unit 37 sends commands to clear the printer controller printstream upstream of the error point (col. 4, lines 12 to 16).

That is, Chen discloses that a unit at the upstream side is cleared when an error occurs in a unit at the downstream side because an error in the unit at the upstream side has no influence on the unit at the downstream side of the error unit. In other words, Chen fails to disclose or suggest a printer that can predict that when an error occurs in the unit at the upstream side, it will influence a unit at the downstream side. In short, Chen does not disclose or suggest clearing a unit at the downstream side when an error occurs in a unit at the upstream side.

Sakurai, on the other hand, only discloses detecting whether or not the cable between the printer and the host computer is connected, and as such clearly fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Chen.

In short, the combined disclosure of Chen and Sakurai fail to disclose or suggest a clearer which would clear the data buffer located on the downstream side from the detector that detects that the printer cable is unplugged. For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 23 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 24, 26, and 28 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 23.

Claim 31 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 23. Accordingly, analogous arguments are applicable to claim 31. For at least similar exemplary reasons, therefore, claim 31 is patentable over the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 09/788,672
Attorney Docket No.: Q62837

combined teachings of Chen and Sakurai. Claims 32, 34, and 36 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 31.

Claims 25 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,413,419 to Oami (hereinafter Oami). Claims 27 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,404,433 to Wheeler (hereinafter “Wheeler”), claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,082 to Takeoka (hereinafter “Takeoka”), and claims 30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,921 to Ryu (hereinafter “Ryu”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the following comments.

Claims 25, 27, 29, and 30 depend on claim 23 and claims 33, 35, 37, and 38 dependent on claim 31. Applicant has already demonstrated that the combined disclosure of Chen and Sakurai fail to disclose or suggest all of the unique features of these independent claims 23 and 31. These secondary references fail to cure the deficient disclosure of Chen and Sakurai.

That is, Oami is being cited only for its disclosure of an ejector. Wheeler is being cited only for its disclosure of a detector that monitors the presence of voltage. Takeoka is being cited only for allegedly disclosing a print start signal being a predetermined string, which is transmitted prior to the transmission of data. Ryu is being cited only for its disclosure of a power switch. In short, Oami, Wheeler, Takeoka, and Ryu, taken alone or in any conceivable combination with Chen and Sakurai, fails to disclose the unique features of claims 23 and 31.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 09/788,672
Attorney Docket No.: Q62837


Accordingly, claims 23 and 31 are clearly patentable over Chen and Sakurai in view of Oami, Chen and Sakurai in view of Wheeler, Chen and Sakurai in view of Takeoka, and Chen and Sakurai in view of Ryu. Claims 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 23 or 31.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q62837